

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR
THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI
GREENVILLE DIVISION**

ANDREW ALEXANDER *et al.*

PLAINTIFFS

VS.

CIVIL ACTION: 4:20-CV-00021-DMB-JMV

PELICIA HALL *et al.*

DEFENDANTS

**ORDER STAYING CERTAIN
PROCEEDINGS**

Local Uniform Civil Rule 16(b)(3)(B) provides that “a motion asserting an immunity defense... stays the attorney conference and disclosure requirements and all discovery, pending the court’s ruling on the motion, including any appeal. Whether to permit discovery on issues related to the motion and whether to permit any portion of the case to proceed pending resolution of the motion are decisions committed to the discretion of the court, upon a motion by any party seeking relief.” L. U. Civ. R. 16(b)(3)(B).

A motion to dismiss involving a qualified immunity defense has been filed. Doc. #45 at 3. Accordingly, staying discovery in this case is appropriate at this time.

If any party desires to take immunity-related discovery, it must file a motion for leave to do so within seven (7) days hereof, setting forth, with specificity, the type and scope of such discovery and an estimated time frame for constructing it. If any party objects to the motion for discovery, it shall file an objection within four (4) days following service of the motion for immunity-related discovery.

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED that the aforementioned proceedings are hereby **STAYED** pending a ruling on the motion. Defendants shall notify the undersigned magistrate judge within seven (7) days of a decision on the motion and shall submit a proposed order lifting

the stay.

SO ORDERED this, the 21st day of July, 2020.

/s/ Jane M. Virden

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE